

\* The original of this document contains information which is subject to withholding from disclosure under 5 U.S.C. 552. Such material has been deleted from this copy and replaced with XXXXXX's.

March 10, 2005

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

Name of Case: Worker Appeal

Date of Filing: September 17, 2004

Case No.: TIA-0205

XXXXXXXXXXXX (the Applicant) applied to the Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Worker Advocacy (OWA) for DOE assistance in filing for state workers' compensation benefits for her late father (the Worker). The OWA referred the application to an independent Physician Panel (the Panel), which determined that the Worker's illness was not related to his work at the DOE. The OWA accepted the Panel's determination, and the Applicant filed an Appeal with the DOE's Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA), challenging the Panel's determination. As explained below, we have concluded that the Appeal should be dismissed.

*I. Background*

*A. The Relevant Statute and Regulations*

The Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 as amended (the Act) concerns workers involved in various ways with the nation's atomic weapons program. See 42 U.S.C. §§ 7384, 7385. As originally enacted, the Act provided for two programs. Subpart B established a Department of Labor (DOL) program providing federal compensation for certain illnesses. See 20 C.F.R. Part 30. Subpart D established a DOE assistance program for DOE contractor employees filing for state workers' compensation benefits. Under the DOE program, an independent physician panel assessed whether a claimed illness or death arose out of and in the course of the worker's employment, and exposure to a toxic substance, at a DOE facility. 42 U.S.C. § 7385o(d)(3); 10 C.F.R. Part 852 (the Physician Panel Rule). The OWA was responsible for this program, and its web site provides extensive information concerning the program.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [www.eh.doe.gov/advocacy](http://www.eh.doe.gov/advocacy)

The Physician Panel Rule provided for an appeal process. An applicant could appeal a decision by the OWA not to submit an application to a Physician Panel, a negative determination by a Physician Panel that was accepted by the OWA, and a final decision by the OWA not to accept a Physician Panel determination in favor of an applicant. The instant appeal was filed pursuant to that Section. The Applicant sought review of a negative determination by a Physician Panel that was accepted by the OWA. 10 C.F.R. § 852.18 (a) (2).

While the Applicant's appeal was pending, Congress repealed Subpart D. Ronald W. Reagan Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005, Pub. L. No. 108-375 (October 28, 2004). Congress added a new subpart to the Act, Subpart E, which establishes a DOL workers' compensation program for DOE contractor employees. Under Subpart E, all Subpart D claims will be considered as Subpart E claims. OHA continues to process appeals until DOL commences Subpart E administration.

#### *B. Procedural Background*

The Worker was employed as an electrician at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant (the plant). He worked at the plant for approximately two years, from 1952 to 1954.

The Applicant filed an application with the OWA, requesting that a physician panel review the Worker's metastatic cancer of the lung. The Panel stated that there were no medical records to support the validity of the alleged condition in the file.<sup>2</sup> The Panel rendered a negative determination which the OWA accepted. Subsequently, the Applicant filed the instant appeal.

In her appeal, the Applicant claims that the Worker's illness was caused by exposure to radiation and toxic materials at the plant. The Applicant also argues that her positive DOL Subpart B award is evidence that her father contracted metastatic cancer of the lung as a result of working at a DOE facility.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Applicant's Appeal Letter.

<sup>3</sup> Physician Panel Report at 1.

## *II. Analysis*

Under the Physician Panel Rule, independent physicians rendered an opinion whether a claimed illness was related to exposure to toxic substances during employment at a DOE facility. The Rule required that the Panel address each claimed illness, make a finding whether that illness was related to toxic exposure at the DOE site, and state the basis for that finding. 10 C.F.R. § 852.12.

The Worker is a member of the Special Exposure Cohort under DOL Subpart B, *i.e.*, he worked at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, and contracted a specified cancer after the beginning of his employment there. See 20 C.F.R. § 30.210. As a result, he received a positive DOL Subpart B determination. A positive DOL Subpart B determination satisfies the Subpart E requirement that the illness be related to a toxic exposure during employment at DOE. Accordingly, Subpart E has rendered moot the physician panel determination and consideration of any challenge to the Panel report is not necessary.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

- (1) The Appeal filed in Worker Advocacy Case No. TIA-0205 be, and hereby is, dismissed.
- (2) This dismissal pertains only to the DOE claim and not to the DOL's review of this claim under Subpart E.
- (3) This is a final order of the Department of Energy.

George B. Breznay  
Director  
Office of Hearings and Appeals

Date: March 10, 2005